

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to this amendment, claims 1-3, 5-20 and 25-26 were pending. In this amendment, claims 1, 16, and 26 are amended, no claims are canceled and no claims are added. No new matter is added. Thus, after entry of this amendment, claims 1-3, 5-20 and 25-26 are pending.

I. Examiner Interview

On February 6, 2009, a telephonic interview was held between Examiner Myint and the undersigned. During the interview, the limitation of an average value plus a random component was discussed. No agreement was reached. The undersigned thanks the Examiner for his time and careful consideration of the arguments presented.

II. Claim Objection

Claim 1 is objected to as being grammatically incorrect by reciting, "**enabling the client application and any additional application able** to concurrently insert data object instances into the ordered sequence." The Examiner requests removal of the word "able." Applicants do not feel this is a grammatical error. However, in the interests of advancing prosecution, applicants have amended claim 1 as suggested by the Examiner. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested..

III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-3, 16-18, and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Trappen* (US 2004/0015814) in view of *Pugh* (Pugh, "Skip Lists: A Probabilistic Alternative to Balanced Trees," Communications of ACM, Vol. 33 No. 6, p-668-676 [online], June 1990 [retrieved on 2008-11-14]), and in further view of *Garza* (US Patent 5,806,064). This rejection is traversed. Applicants respectfully submit that these references do not teach or suggest each element of these claims, as amended, alone or in combination.

Claim 1

For example, claim 1, as amended, recites in part, “*a generator adapted to create a database schema in response to a model description, the database schema including at least one table and configured to store a set of data object instances in the database.*” The above limitation is similar to previously presented claim 16. In the rejection of claim 16, the Office Action alleges that “*a generator adapted to create the database schema in response to a model description,*” is taught by *Trappen*, P[0071], Data Access System 12 in Fig. 1, and a UML class diagram implemented by data access system 12. (Office Action Pg. 10).

Trappen describes a system for exposing methods used to manipulate a database. (*Trappen* Abstract). A Data Access System may be used to map from an object oriented environment to a relational or object-relational databases (*Trappen* P[0052]). Queries may be generated in the object environment and translated to the appropriate database commands. (*Trappen* P[0055-0056]). However, *Trappen* does not teach or suggest “*a generator adapted to create a database schema in response to a model description.*” *Trappen* has been reviewed by the undersigned, and no reference is made to creation of the database schema. *Trappen* assumes that the database schema is already in existence, and is presenting a system for mapping between an existing database schema and an object environment for update and query purposes. Although *Trappen* may describe an object environment in terms of a UML diagram, *Trappen* does not teach or suggest a generator that uses the UML diagram to create the database schema.

Furthermore, *Trappen* does not teach or suggest a model application interface “*operable to convert the set of data object instances into one of at least two different object formats based on the client application’s requirements.*” *Trappen* describes a system that may map an object format to a database table format. (*Trappen* Fig. 1). *Trappen* does not teach or suggest multiple object formats that vary depending on the specific client application that is accessing the data.

The addition of the *Pugh* reference, even if there was motivation to do so, does not resolve the above mentioned discrepancies. *Pugh* describes skip lists, and does not teach or suggest “*a generator adapted to create a database schema in response to a model description*” or an application programming interface “*operable to convert the set of data object instances into one of at least two different object formats based on the client application’s requirements.*”

The addition of the *Garza* reference also does not resolve the above mentioned discrepancies. *Garza* describes a system for ordering of database records. *Garza* does not teach or suggest “a generator adapted to create a database schema in response to a model description” or an application programming interface “operable to convert the set of data object instances into one of at least two different object formats based on the client application’s requirements.”

As such, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and the claims which depend therefrom is respectfully requested. Furthermore, claim 26 contains limitations that are also not taught or suggested by the cited references for reasons including those set forth above. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 26 is respectfully requested.

Claim 16

Claim 16 has been rewritten in independent form. Each and every limitation of claim 16 is not taught or suggested by the cited references. For example, claim 16 recites in part, “a generator adapted to create the database schema in response to a model description.” As discussed above with respect to claim 1, such limitations are not taught or suggested by the cited references. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 16, and the claims which depend therefrom is respectfully requested. Furthermore, as claim 16 has only been written in independent form, it is respectfully requested that any new rejection of claim 16 be made non-final.

IV. Amendments to the Claims

Unless otherwise specified or addressed in the remarks section, amendments to the claims are made for purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof. The amendments are supported by the specification and do not add new matter. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, including places such as paragraph [0030-0031].

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 415-576-0200.

Respectfully submitted,

/Preetam B. Pagar/

Preetam B. Pagar
Reg. No. 57,684

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 415-576-0200
Fax: 415-576-0300
Attachments
PBP:pbp
61812010 v1